



LWG Stormwater Data Gaps

Sanders, Dawn to: Kristine Koch, Karen Tarnow (E-mail)
Cc: "Scheffler, Linda", "Rick Applegate (E-mail)"

09/13/2007 11:37 AM

> Morning!

> Linda and I have had a chance to think about the stormwater data set and

> have some preliminary comments that we'd like to pass on. Based on a

> review of the stormwater data set, there are definitely sites that we

> would recommend for additional stormwater sampling this fall. This

> analysis is primarily based on what PCB data are available for each

> station and additional sites might warrant sampling for other analytes.

>

> Our criteria for determining where sampling needs to occur are based on:

>

> a) If the site has been designated as "Unique", then it needs the full set

> of 3 samples, especially for PCBs and any COCs for the AOPC that it

> discharges to.

> b) If the site is for land use with relatively few stations (we would

> count all land use stations except heavy industrial in this class). Since

> the land use stations will be used to represent a much larger area for

> loading purposes, we would be at least 3 samples per station to have the

> minimum acceptable samples.

>

> Based on this, here are some recommendations from the City for additional

> sampling that needs to occur in the fall

>

> 1. Gunderson and Arkema: These are unique sites (which need a minimum of

> 3 samples to characterize them - one of the Gunderson OFs had only 1

> sample, and Arkema only 2).

>

> 2. Hwy 30: Looks like the sample location was in wrong location and so is

> not representative of land use, so it would need 3 samples. Even if it

> was in the right location, it would still need an additional 2 samples.

> Since there are only 2 Major Transportation stations, and the data for St

> Johns Bridge looks like it might be biased high, we need this additional

> land use station.

>
> 3. Forest Park (in 22C): This is the only open
space station and only had
> 2 samples - needs at least one more.
>
> 4. Port Basin D - did not analyze for PCBs even
though it was supposed to
> be a light industrial land use station. Need 3
samples for PCBs
>
> 5. UPRR Albina: had two samples, but given the
relatively unique nature of
> rail yard operations and the land area within the
study area comprised of
> rail yards, data from this site may be considered
as "specific industrial"
> pending data evaluation.
>
> 6. OF 49: Residential land use station had 2
stormwater samples, but no
> sediment trap sample. Land use numbers could get
biased to the
> residential area above T4.
>
> There will likely be others, especially since we
haven't looked at the
> solids to see what information we might be missing
from the stormwater
> samples.
>
>
> Dawn L. Sanders
> City of Portland
> Bureau of Environmental Services
> 503/823-7263
> dawns@bes.ci.portland.or.us
>